THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE BULLETIN

SEPTEMBER 2, 1939

Vol. I: No. 10—Publication 1371

Contents

Europe:
Bombardment from the air of civilian populations: Page
President Roosevelt's appeal. 181
Reply of France 181
Reply of Great Britain 182
Reply of Italy 182
Reply of Poland 182
Reply of Germany 183
Appeals for peace:
Reply of King Victor Emmanuel of Italy to President Roosevelt's appeal for peace 183
Reply of Chancellor Hitler of Germany to President Roosevelt's appeal for peace 183
Endorsement by Ecuador 184
Endorsement by Haiti 184
German-Polish relations and the anschluss of Danzig . 184
German restrictions on movement of neutral aircraft . 185
Evacuation of American citizens from Europe 185
Presentation of letters of credence by the British Ambassador 186
The American republics:
Payment to Nicaragua in settlement of treaty obligation 187
General:
Remarks by Hugh R. Wilson before the Veterans of Foreign Wars 188

[*Over*]

Page

Departmental changes:
Special Division established 193
Foreign Service:
Death of Julius G. Lay 194
International conferences, commissions, etc.:
Fifth Meeting of the International Radio Consulting Committee 194
Twenty-seventh International Congress of Americanists 194
Treaty information:
Organization:
Protocol for the Amendment of the Preamble, of Articles 1, 4, and 5, and of the Annex to the Covenant of the League of Nations. 195
Education:
Procès-Verbal Concerning the Application of Articles IV, V, VI, VII, IX, XII, and XIII of the Convention of October 11, 1933, for Facilitating the International Circulation of Films of an Educational Character 195
Extradition:
Extradition Treaty With Liberia 195
Extradition Treaty With Monaco 195
Health:
Convention Modifying the International Sanitary Convention of June 21, 1926 195
Nationality:
Convention With Finland Regulating Military Obligations in Certain Cases of Double Nationality . . 196
Commerce:
Treaty of Commerce and Navigation With Iraq . . . 196
Treaty of Friendship, Commerce, and Navigation With Liberia 196
Labor:
Conventions of the International Labor Conference . 196
Navigation:
International Load Line Convention (Treaty Series No. 858) 196
Agreement Concerning Manned Lightships Not on Their Stations 197
Publications:
Convention on Interchange of Publications 197
Consular:
Consular Convention With Liberia 197

Europe

BOMBARDMENT FROM THE AIR OF CIVILIAN POPULATIONS

President Roosevelt's Appeal

[Released to the press September 1]

The President at 4:30 o'clock the morning of September 1 addressed the following message to the Governments of Great Britain, France, Italy, Germany, and Poland:

"The ruthless bombing from the air of civilians in unfortified centers of population during the course of the hostilities which have raged in various quarters of the earth during the past few years, which has resulted in the maiming and in the death of thousands of defenseless men, women and children, has sickened the hearts of every civilized man and woman, and has profoundly shocked the conscience of humanity.

"If resort is had to this form of inhuman barbarism during the period of the tragic conflagration with which the world is now confronted, hundreds of thousands of innocent human beings who have no responsibility for, and who are not even remotely participating in, the hostilities which have now broken out, will lose their lives. I am therefore addressing this urgent appeal to every government which may be engaged in hostilities publicly to affirm its determination that its armed forces shall in no event, and under no circumstances, undertake the bombardment from the air of civilian populations or of unfortified cities, upon the understanding that these same rules of warfare will be scrupulously observed by all of their opponents. I request an immediate reply.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT"

Reply of France

[Released to the press September 1]

Following is the text of the reply of the French Government to the President's message of September 1, 1939. Ambassador William C. Bullitt at Paris received the text at 6:15 (Paris time) the evening of September 1 from the French Foreign Office:

"MR. AMBASSADOR:

"You kindly handed me this morning an urgent message from the President of the United States of America.

"I have the honor to address to you herewith the reply of the French Government.

"The French Government hastens to reply to the appeal, which the President of the United States of America addresses to all Governments which may find themselves engaged in the conflict, to ask them to avoid all recourse, in every case and in every circumstance, to bombardment from the air of civilian populations.

"The French Government highly appreciating the spirit which inspires the initiative of President Franklin D. Roosevelt, affirms its firm intention to conduct hostilities, if war should be imposed upon it as a result of the German aggression, in strict accord with the laws of war; and to do everything in its power to spare civilian populations the sufferings which modern war may entail. It is in this spirit of humanity, which has always dictated in all circumstances the conduct of the French Government, that orders have already been

given to the Commander-in-Chief of all the French forces.

"These orders exclude in particular the bombardment of civilian populations, and limit bombardment from the air to strictly military objectives.

"It goes without saying that the French Government reserves the right to have recourse to any action which it might consider appropriate, if the adversary should not observe the restrictions to which the French Government itself has subjected the operations of its air forces."

Reply of Great Britain

[Released to the press September 1]

Following is the text of the reply from His Britannic Majesty's Government to the President's message of September 1, 1939:

"His Majesty's Government welcome the weighty and moving appeal of the President of the United States against the bombardment from the air of civilian populations or of unfortified cities. Deeply impressed by the humanitarian considerations to which the President's message refers, it was already the settled policy of His Majesty's Government should they become involved in hostilities to refrain from such action and to confine bombardment to strictly military objectives upon the understanding that those same rules will be scrupulously observed by all their opponents. They had already concerted in detail with certain other governments the rules that in such an event they would impose upon themselves and make publicly known."

Reply of Italy

[Released to the press September 1]

Ambassador William Phillips at Rome on September 1 reported that the following oral statement was given to him by an official at the Foreign Office at 5 p. m. (Italian time), in reply to the President's message of September 1, 1939:

"Since the Fascist Government after today's meeting of the Council of Ministers has officially declared and announced 'that Italy will not take any initiative in military operations' the possibility which formed the object of the message from the President of the United States dated September 1 is therefore to be excluded as far as concerns Italy."

Reply of Poland

[Released to the press September 1]

Following is the text of a note received by the Secretary of State the night of September 1 from the Polish Ambassador in answer to the President's message of September 1:

"SIR:

"Upon instructions of my Government I have the honor to request your good offices in transmitting to the President the following reply of the Polish Government to his message of this morning.

"The text of the reply is as follows:

"'The Polish Government acknowledge with thanks President Roosevelt's telegram regarding bombing from the air of civilians in unfortified centers of population during war. They entirely agree with the principles expressed and with the feelings which inspire them. It is with these principles in mind that the supreme military authorities in Poland issued formal orders to refrain in the event of war from the bombardment of open towns and from such similar action as would be of direct danger to the civilian population. Unfortunately Poland whose territory has been since this early morning the object of unprovoked aggression by German forces has already been the victim of several attacks by air. The reported losses in civilian population render it doubtful as to whether the opposing side is respecting the rules to which the President refers. These rules which are the outcome of natural human feelings remain in force on condition and on the understanding that they will be also scrupulously observed by the opposing party.'

"Accept [etc.] JERZY POTOCKI"

Reply of Germany

[Released to the press September 2]

The American Chargé at Berlin, Mr. Alexander C. Kirk, reported to the Department of State the night of September 1 that he was in receipt of a note signed by the Minister for Foreign Affairs forwarding a message from the German Chancellor, of which the following is a translation, with the request that it be transmitted immediately to the President:

"BERLIN, *September 1, 1939.*

"DEAR MR. CHARGÉ D'AFFAIRES:

"With reference to your note of today, in which you communicated to me a message from the President of the United States concerning the bombing of nonmilitary objectives, I have the honor to convey to you below the reply of the Reich Chancellor to this message:

"'The view expressed in the message of President Roosevelt that it is a humanitarian principle to refrain from the bombing of nonmilitary objectives under all circumstances in connection with military operations, corresponds completely with my own point of view and has been advocated by me before. I, therefore, unconditionally endorse the proposal that the governments taking part in the hostilities now in progress make public a declaration in this sense.

"'For my own part, I already gave notice in my Reichstag speech of today that the German air force had received the order to restrict its operations to military objectives. It is a self-understood prerequisite for the maintenance of this order that opposing air forces adhere to the same rule. Adolf Hitler.'

"I should be very grateful to you if you would communicate the above answer immediately to President Roosevelt.

"I avail myself [etc.] RIBBENTROP"

✦✦✦✦✦✦✦

APPEALS FOR PEACE

Reply of King Victor Emmanuel of Italy to President Roosevelt's Appeal for Peace

[Released to the press August 30]

Following is a translation of a message from the King of Italy to the President of the United States:

"AUGUST 30, 1939.

"I am grateful to you for your interest. I have immediately transmitted your message to my Government. As is known to all, there has been done and there is being done by us whatever is possible to bring about a peace with justice.

VITTORIO EMANUELE"

Reply of Chancellor Hitler of Germany to President Roosevelt's Appeal for Peace

[Released to the press September 1]

Following is a translation of a message received this afternoon by the Secretary of State from the German Chargé in the United States, Mr. Hans Thomsen:

"GERMAN EMBASSY,
Washington, D. C., August 31, 1939.

"MR. SECRETARY OF STATE:

"By order of my Government, I wish to use your kind intermediary for the purpose of stating to the President of the United States that his messages of August 25 and 26 addressed to the German Fuehrer and Reich Chancellor have been greatly appreciated by the latter.

"The German Fuehrer and Reich Chancellor has also, on his side, left nothing untried for the purpose of settling the dispute between Germany and Poland in a friendly manner. Even at the last hour he accepted an offer from the Government of Great Britain to mediate in this dispute. Owing to the attitude of the

Polish Government, however, all these endeavors have remained without result.

"Accept [etc.] THOMSEN"

Endorsement by Ecuador

Following are a translation of a message received by the President from the President of the Republic of Ecuador and President Roosevelt's reply:

[Released to the press August 28]

"QUITO, *August 26, 1939.*

"In this grave hour I adhere to the new urgent appeal which Your Excellency has made to European countries to seek the necessary solution of their differences by pacific means. Whether that noble invitation is accepted or not, Your Excellency will have deserved the applause of all men who are observing, with fear, the approach of a catastrophe for civilization.

AURELIO MOSQUERA NARVAEZ"

[Released to the press August 30]

"AUGUST 29, 1939.

"I have received with the deepest appreciation Your Excellency's message. It is indeed heartening to have this additional proof of the devotion of Your Excellency and of the Government of Ecuador to the cause of peace and to learn that the efforts which I have made on behalf of the maintenance of peace meet with your support and with your approval.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT"

Endorsement by Haiti

[Released to the press August 31]

Following are a translation of a message received by the President from the President of the Republic of Haiti and President Roosevelt's reply:

"PORT-AU-PRINCE, *August 30, 1939.*

"Both in my name and in that of the Haitian people I ask Your Excellency to accept my most cordial felicitations on your recent and always generous interventions in favor of peace. The Haitian people, which is developing in peace, is happy to take this opportunity to renew to Your Excellency the assurance of its complete devotion to the noble cause which you are defending with so much faith and energy in the higher interest of humanity and civilization. I confirm to Your Excellency my former precise declarations on the complete collaboration of my country in the work of defending peace by all the means in its power.

STENIO VINCENT"

"THE WHITE HOUSE, *August 31, 1939.*

"At this critical time I am indeed grateful for the message which in Your Excellency's name and in that of the Haitian people so resolutely supports the efforts of this Government for peace, and reaffirms the determination of Haiti, by all the means in its power, to cooperate in its preservation. Your Excellency's message will encourage and hearten all of those who, joining with the peoples of the Americas, favor the settlement of international differences by peaceful means.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT"

✦ ✦ ✦

GERMAN-POLISH RELATIONS AND THE ANSCHLUSS OF DANZIG

[Released to the press September 1]

The Department of State received the following telegram at 4:28 a. m., September 1, from the American Chargé in Berlin, Mr. Alexander C. Kirk:

"A proclamation by Hitler has just been issued declaring that the Polish State has rejected a peaceful solution of the problem of neighborly relations with Germany and after enumerating offenses committed by Poland against German rights and territory states that force must be met by force and that the battle will be fought in defense of German territory and honor.

"It is also announced that the anschluss of Danzig to the Reich has been declared and has been communicated by Forster to Hitler.

"The Embassy has been notified by the Foreign Office that a meeting of the Reichstag will take place at 10 o'clock this morning."

✦ ✦ ✦

GERMAN RESTRICTIONS ON MOVEMENT OF NEUTRAL AIRCRAFT

[Released to the press September 1]

The American Chargé at Berlin, Mr. Alexander C. Kirk, reported to the Department of State September 1 that the following is a translation of a note dated September 1 which he had just received from the German Foreign Office:

"The Foreign Office has the honor to inform the Embassy of the United States of America as follows with the request for immediate forwarding to the Government of the United States of America:

"DECLARATION OF TERRITORY OF AVIATION WARNING

"For the sake of protection against hostile attacks by Polish air forces, military operations over the Danzig Bay and the territory of the Polish state must be expected from the time of this announcement. All neutral aircraft are warned in their own interest against flying over the territories mentioned below. These territories are the territory of the Polish state and the sea area bounded on the west by the parallel of longitude 18 degrees 5 east, also the Polish border, on the east by the parallel of longitude 20 degrees east (near Bruesterort) on the north by the parallel of latitude 55 degrees north. In these areas neutral aircraft are exposed to the danger of being shot at if they render assistance to Polish forces, if they do not land immediately on warning shots given by German air forces with tracer shells in front of the warned aircraft, or if they act contrary to the instruction to keep to a given course or to abstain from communications."

✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦ ✦

EVACUATION OF AMERICAN CITIZENS FROM EUROPE

[Released to the press September 1]

As it is obviously the wish of the Government of the United States to facilitate the removal of American citizens from the European scene of possible danger, there was formed, as of August 23, a committee consisting of representatives for the State and Navy Departments and the Maritime Commission, for the purpose of studying practical means for making available to the numerous Americans now in Europe transportation to the United States. With the same end in view, certain American ambassadors in Europe have issued warnings to American citizens to return to the United States. These precautionary measures have the support of the United States Government, which, while refraining from ordering Americans out of Europe, considers that those of its citizens who are there in the capacity of tourists and others who have no impelling reason for remaining would be well advised to return to this country.

In order to facilitate this, the United States Government has been cooperating with certain American shipping concerns, which have altered schedules and itineraries of certain of their vessels in order to shorten turnaround and thus make more voyages available for the rapid evacuation of American citizens. The Government is endeavoring to bring about this program of orderly evacuation with the least possible disturbance to existing commercial shipping services. In view of the emergency the Government has seen fit in certain instances to grant permission for certain well-equipped and fast freight ships to carry pas-

sengers in addition to permitting the carriage of an increased number of persons by passenger vessels.

The success of these governmental measures is evidenced by the fact that, according to a report from the Embassy in London yesterday, passenger accommodations on vessels sailing to the United States from Great Britain exceed the demand for such accommodations. Some vessels were reported to have as many as 12, 30, and even 40 berths available.

According to statistics available to the Department for the week ended September 1, some 9,300 passengers arrived at United States Atlantic ports from Europe. In addition to these, for the same period, some 1,200 passengers, a large percentage of whom were possibly Americans, arrived at Canadian ports.

It is interesting to note that of those entering United States ports, some 54 persons arrived by trans-Atlantic airships. Thus, for the first time in history, air travel has served as a transoceanic means of evacuation.

From September 1 to October 4 scheduled westbound sailings of American vessels have a capacity of about 9,000 passengers while scheduled westbound ships of prospective neutral countries have accommodations for some 8,000 passengers, a total of 17,000. In addition a considerable number of passengers may be accommodated on vessels of the around-the-world services returning to United States ports through the Mediterranean.

✦✦✦✦✦✦✦

PRESENTATION OF LETTERS OF CREDENCE BY THE BRITISH AMBASSADOR

[Released to the press August 30]

Remarks of the newly appointed British Ambassador, the Most Honorable the Marquess of Lothian, C. H., upon the occasion of the presentation of his letters of credence:

MR. PRESIDENT:

In handing you today the Royal letter accrediting me as His Majesty's Ambassador to the United States I am instructed by the King, my august sovereign, to convey to you his friendly greetings and to express to you his earnest hope for the happiness and prosperity of the United States.

I have further been instructed by Their Majesties the King and Queen to convey to you, Mr. President, and through you to the American people, their most grateful thanks for the cordial welcome and the unbounded hospitality that were extended to them on the occasion of their recent visit to the United States. The friendly impressions they derived from that visit will not soon fade from Their Majesties' minds, and they feel that it was evidence not only of the good will and understanding which now exist between the British and the American peoples but that nothing that can arise is likely to disturb this happy state of affairs.

These sentiments are shared to the full by His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom. Following the example set by my distinguished predecessor, Sir Ronald Lindsay, and in accordance with my instructions, I shall do my utmost to maintain and fortify the good relations which now for many years have existed between Great Britain and the United States, and I trust that in this congenial task I shall receive your support, Mr. President, and that of your administration.

Unfortunately, I assume my office at a time when the whole world is disturbed by war, by rumors of war, and by preparations for war. It is the first purpose of the Government I have the honor to represent to do everything in its power to maintain peace, to bring about what-

ever political and economic adjustments reason and justice may require by pacific means, and so help to bring the nations back to stable prosperity and stable peace. They are confident that in this search for peace they are only pursuing the same ends which you, Mr. President, and the American people also have at heart.

May I in conclusion express my own keen pleasure in being accredited as His Majesty's Ambassador to the United States. I have for many years been a frequent visitor to these shores, and I have long entertained a deep affection and admiration for the remarkable qualities and achievements of the American people and for the institutions under which they live.

President Roosevelt's reply to the remarks of the Marquess of Lothian:

MR. AMBASSADOR:

It is a source of special gratification to receive you as His Britannic Majesty's Ambassador and to acknowledge His Majesty's kind and friendly wishes on my behalf and on that of the American people.

I cordially reciprocate these good wishes and ask you to convey to your sovereign, whose recent visit to the United States in company with Her Majesty emphasized the close friendship between the American and British peoples, my earnest hope for the tranquillity, prosperity, and happiness of the British people and the success of the wise and patriotic labors of His Majesty for their welfare.

It is the sincere desire of the American Government and people that the relationship of mutual cordiality and mutual respect now happily existing between our countries shall continue to prevail as one of the cornerstones upon which the structure of peace is founded. Your predecessor, Sir Ronald Lindsay, won a distinguished place in the esteem of my countrymen for his labors over many years to foster practical understanding between the British and American Nations, and I confidently anticipate that you, Mr. Ambassador, whose achievement in the field of international cooperation is well known to us, have come prepared to work hard in the same cause.

The principal task of international statesmanship is to effect peaceful and constructive solutions of controversies between nations and thus to obviate the folly of war, which unhappily seems to overshadow the world today. The American Government and people have consistently over many years devoted themselves to the search for permanent peace and an end of the fear of aggression. In this effort, I am happy to record, they have always found that the British Government and people were pursuing the same ends. It is particularly gratifying, therefore, to receive from you, Mr. Ambassador, at this time of crisis, renewed assurance of your Government's determination to maintain the peace.

I take pleasure in welcoming you to the United States and in expressing the hope that your stay in this country may be long and happy.

The American Republics

PAYMENT TO NICARAGUA IN SETTLEMENT OF TREATY OBLIGATION

[Released to the press September 2]

The Minister of Nicaragua in Washington, Dr. Don León De Bayle, called at the Department of State today to receive from the Under Secretary, Mr. Sumner Welles, a check on the Treasurer of the United States in the amount of $72,000. This payment was made in accordance with the provisions of article II of the treaty of April 14, 1938, between the United States of America and the Republic of Nicaragua. An appropriation for this purpose was contained in the Department of State Appropriation Act for the fiscal year 1940.

This treaty provided for the adjustment of certain accounts of indebtedness and a claim for a refund of income taxes between the United States and Nicaragua. A description of the treaty will be found in the *Press Releases* of April 16, 1938 (Vol. XVIII, No. 446), pp. 488–489.

General

REMARKS BY HUGH R. WILSON BEFORE THE VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS[1]

[Released to the press August 29]

Mr. Chairman, my most genuine thanks for your references to me. They are deeply appreciated.

It is my privilege to speak to the Veterans of Foreign Wars on the fortieth anniversary of the founding of your organization. Forty years in our lives comprises events of immense historical significance. Your organization epitomizes the crucial points of the history of our lifetimes. Gentlemen, I congratulate you on your organization and on your anniversary. May you have many happy returns of the day.

Surely there is no group of men in the United States who have a deeper interest than yourselves in the foreign policy of your Government. You have taken your risks and given your service at times when the use of force has been necessary in our relations with some foreign nation; you have every right and every reason to have a deep interest in the tendencies and fluctuations, in the struggle of opposing theories, which in a democracy make the resultant of foreign policy.

Let there be no mistake about this matter; in our form of government, policy in respect of foreign affairs, as policy in respect of internal matters, is not determined in a vacuum. Plans are not laid and moves are not made irrespective of what the American public is thinking and feeling, merely in accordance with the personal predilections of a small group of men working behind closed doors and in secret. The men who shape our foreign policy know better than others that in the final analysis the public opinion of the American people is going to prevail and that a policy can only be considered seriously if it is in harmony with that opinion. Public opinion can sometimes be altered, or if you like, educated into a different direction. It may be influenced, canalized, molded, or encouraged, but it would be a bold executive indeed who would dare to disregard it.

I am told that during encampments of previous years your subject for discussion, under different names, has been the means of keeping the United States from being under the necessity of entering another war. I am told further that there has been wide evolution in your thought as to how this purpose was to be accomplished. It will be in line with your earlier endeavors then if I discuss this problem. I shall try to add my bit to the finding of a way to prevent a further influx of young recruits qualified to join the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

We use the phrase constantly, "How shall we keep the United States out of war?" I prefer the phrase "How shall we keep the United States at peace?" There is not perhaps a very deep distinction; certainly, however, there is some. We might perhaps keep the country out of war but still have a country that was torn by internal dissension, that was riven by its sentimental predispositions, that was torn by class struggle as a result of the sympathies or antipathies for one or the other parties to a struggle abroad. We might have all these things and still keep the country out of war. But could we say under such circumstances that the United States was at peace? A peaceful nation presupposes internal harmony, unity of purpose in its foreign objectives, a sense of patriotism and duty to the state pervading all strata of society. Only thus can our Nation

[1] Delivered by Mr. Wilson, American Ambassador to Germany, at the annual banquet of the fortieth national encampment of Veterans of Foreign Wars, Boston, Mass., August 28, 1939.

be at peace, and only thus can we exercise the authority and the ability to further our own interests, which our resources and abilities hold open for us. Hence I submit that our problem is to keep the Nation at peace and that such is and should be the major objective of your Government.

I state without fear of contradiction that all men of good will in the country share this objective. I have yet to meet the mentally adult man who does not proclaim that such is his intention and desire. We are as united in our primary opposition to war as we are in our opposition to sin, and we are about as widely split in our methods of gaining our first purpose as we are in our methods of making the world a better place to live in. Men of the most unquestioned patriotism are profoundly divided on the method of keeping the United States at peace. But all of them desire to do so.

The great difficulty of legislating in time of peace in anticipation for war is that you are passing legislation to provide for a contingency of which you are unaware of the facts. Men with finite minds cannot foresee the infinite complexities that may arise, and legislation designed to meet one contingency may prove totally inadequate to meet the actual phenomenon which does arise. Indeed it may be that in the way in which the crisis presents itself, the legislation already adopted may accomplish a purpose the exact opposite of that anticipated. At the time of the outbreak of hostilities between Japan and China there was a so-called "neutrality law" on our statute books. The President did not find that "a state of war" existed, in the language of the act, and the law was not put into effect. And this action or rather this omission to act met with the general approval of the people of the United States. At the time of beginning of the civil war in Spain a scrutiny of the neutrality law showed at once that its provisions were inadequate to meet the situation, so a law had to be enacted hastily to cover a situation which could not have been foreseen by our legislators. Thus experiences have shown that in two important external contingencies of the past few years the neutrality legislation was not adequate to meet the situation. Legislation prepared in advance may favor the side in a conflict to which our public opinion is overwhelmingly hostile; equally its rigid terms may be the very conditions that would involve us in the risk of war.

Furthermore, can anyone conceive that laws prepared in time of peace could survive any appreciable time against a public opinion inflamed by the passions engendered by a foreign war of any magnitude? Certainly, if such a war breaks out and if the provisions of the existing laws on neutrality do not happen to coincide with the sympathies and desires of the American people, then the law, unless, as I propose to explain later, it is strictly limited in scope and designed primarily to prevent an unwarranted or unnecessary loss of American lives, will be swept away like chaff. When I was at college a number of years ago, it was the custom, whenever Yale was fortunate enough to defeat Harvard or Princeton at a football game in New Haven, for the undergraduates to pour into the evening performance at the old Hyperion Theater and there give vent to their jubilation in a manner that might be termed by carping critics, riotous and indecorous. Each year the management of the theater would publish in the lobby regulations as to how far the celebration would be tolerated. Viewing the results year by year I was struck with wonder at the simple optimism of the management. Watching attempts at legislation for the event of war fills me with the same sort of wonder when that legislation attempts to prescribe in advance the attitude of the American people toward the parties to any war. American youth and the American public have something of the same sort of ruthless determination to do what they please when sufficiently aroused.

A distinction may, however, be made between a statute designed to save us from being involved, which could have no unneutral effect, and statutes which might and probably would have such effect. Under the former category

there are certain domestic acts which can serve a useful purpose in minimizing our risks and in the safeguarding of our economic system. Past experience seems to show us that the greatest danger to the peace of this country is most likely to arise from the destruction of American lives. Legislation of the first category described would restrict certain rights of individual American citizens or groups, serve to avoid incidents which might arouse public opinion and result in our becoming involved in a conflict although the majority of our nationals were not affected, and would not constitute the abandonment of our neutral rights but only a reasonable restriction of them in the public interest by domestic legislation. For example, American citizens might well be prevented from performing acts such as traveling on armed belligerent vessels or in certain zones of combat, and American ships could be restrained from entering these combat areas, where such acts would bring about a situation which could endanger our neutrality. At least our citizens must understand clearly that if they choose to engage in such acts they must do so entirely at their own risk and that they have forfeited all right to claim government assistance if such acts bring them into difficulty. Further measures might be taken to provide that the export of goods to belligerents should be preceded by transfer of title and to curtail or supervise loans which would prevent an undue sudden expansion and subsequent dislocation of our economic life. It might also be possible to regulate the solicitation and collection in the United States of funds for belligerents with all the attendant propaganda and appeals for sympathy in a foreign cause. These would be domestic acts which would have only an indirect relation to the hostilities in question. The touchstone as to whether legislation is practical or impractical in accomplishing its purpose of keeping the United States at peace is whether such legislation may bring about a situation which will increase or decrease our risk. All the latter, it seems to me, should be discarded and legislation be adopted only when the matters involved are of concern purely to the people of the United States and without direct relationship to the hostilities in progress.

The attempt to differentiate between various sorts of shipments to belligerents on the grounds that a particular sort of shipment is immoral, on the other hand, seems to me to be predicated on unsound reasoning. You Veterans of Foreign Wars can be under no misapprehension in this respect. You know that materials are just as important to a belligerent as the finished article; you fail, I am sure, to see a distinction between the morality of shipping arms and munitions of war and the morality of shipping copper for fuses, steel for shells, and cotton for explosives. I can understand the argument, though I think it is untenable, which urges a complete embargo of all articles to both parties to a conflict in the event of war. This is an argument which has as its logical basis the concept that if you want to keep out of trouble the thing to do is to keep away from trouble. I say I think the argument is untenable mainly because a complete embargo of all articles would bring about such a dislocation of our economic structure that we would be paralyzed both economically and politically.

There is another aspect to the question of embargoes which in my opinion is worthy of consideration. The threat of closing access to all markets of foodstuffs and raw materials is a definite encouragement to those abroad who argue that their countries must be made economically self-sufficient so that in time of crisis they will not be deprived of essential goods. To advocate economic recovery through the encouragement of freer trade, the relaxation of tariff barriers, and the elimination of excessive obstacles to exchange of goods, while in the next breath threatening to close our markets to all parties engaged in the hostilities constitutes such an apparent contradiction as to create legitimate doubts as to the sincerity of the American trade program. Moreover any impetus given to economic nationalism and autarchy merely intensifies trade rivalries and

fertilizes the ground with the germs of mistrust, suspicion, and eventually war.

In any case it does not seem to be necessary to discuss this point at length since the project for a complete embargo of all articles is not being pushed vigorously and does not therefore enter into the realm of practical consideration. But the differentiation between various categories of permissible shipment does not seem to me logical or likely to accomplish any useful purpose. Rather, the contrary, it would seem in many cases to put a penalty where our public opinion would not care to put it.

The Secretary of State in discussing this phase of the neutrality problem said on November 6, 1935, and reiterated in his letter of May 27, 1939, to the chairman of the appropriate Committees in the Senate and House of Representatives that "To assume that by placing an embargo on arms we are making ourselves secure from the dangers of conflict with belligerent countries is to close our eyes to manifold dangers in other directions. We cannot assume that when provision has been made to stop the shipment of arms, which as absolute contraband have always been regarded as subject to seizure by a belligerent, we may complacently sit back with the feeling that we are secure from all danger."

After all, there is a thing called international law. Many have denied that it still exists, but the fact that it still does exist is one of the principles for which our Government has most steadily contended. We have struggled for the maintenance and observance of international law in every quarter of the globe. International law is the result of slow growth in the practice of nations; it has slowly evolved in struggle and dispute and has been found by and large the most adequate way for nations to preserve their neutrality in case of conflict. It has been well said that there is nothing new under the sun; future conflicts will have a fundamental similarity to those of the past; and the broad rules of international law will be found the most useful, together with such purely domestic acts as will minimize our risk and maintain our economic structure, to preserve us at peace if the rest of the world is in conflict. Those rules provide that belligerents may purchase in the markets of neutrals and not that they may purchase only certain commodities.

I have discussed at some length what I might call the negative aspects of this question. Is there a positive approach to the problem? If it is meant by that question to ask whether there is any means which will guarantee us immunity if the world is torn by a first-class struggle, then I must regretfully but decisively answer in the negative. There is no guarantee. There can be no assurance that certain acts of belligerents will not so inflame us or endanger our interests that we will feel an irresistible urge to enter the conflict. You will notice I do not use the phrase "we may be drawn into the conflict." I sincerely hope that if we ever enter a conflict, which God forbid, it will not be because we are "drawn into it." Being drawn in implies a slipping through carelessness, a submergence of our own will to others. Our remote geographical position gives us time for choice. Let us take advantage of it to think clearly and decide our course by reason, even in the storm of passion and propaganda that a great war will call forth.

That thought brings me to one of the positive considerations, namely, that the better educated our public opinion the less the likelihood of our entering a conflict and the greater the hope of our remaining at peace. The more our people have considered and discussed the various contingencies which may arise, the more they will keep their heads in a moment of crisis, the less likely they are to fall a prey to propaganda and to their own passions. Let me state again that in our democratic land it is inconceivable that we should enter a war unless the American people feel that they must do so. The people will have the final decision—the more reason that every one of us should study and ponder and keep his mind clear for the real decision.

We have better means than most peoples for study and for comprehension of what takes place in the world. I have lived in many

lands but in none of them have I found such a wealth of material, such abundance of impartial information on foreign affairs. There is a flow into our press from every corner of the globe, a lot of it written by conscientious men and women earnestly trying to present pictures as they see them. But the very abundance of the material available makes selection indispensable, so each one of us is obliged to select those writers from different points of the world whose wisdom we can trust and whose stories stand the test of time. We haven't time for the purely sensational in a period when we must get at facts for ourselves. There are hundreds of organizations for study of foreign affairs, all trying for mutual enlightenment. You Veterans of Foreign Wars have recognized the necessity for study and discussion. Every such discussion, all such reading and study renders each one of us more competent to form an opinion in the crucial moment and to form an enlightened opinion, provided we realize the responsibility that lies on us.

Few crises arise suddenly and out of a clear sky. They are nearly always preceded by a whole chain of events before they culminate. Obviously, the attitude of any government, its day-by-day decisions in the development of a crisis, have a profound effect upon the way in which the crisis presents itself and upon the shaping of public opinion and the attitude with which the people of the land will confront a crisis. Wise maneuvers during the initial or diplomatic stages of a struggle may often avert the struggle itself and indeed may and frequently have averted struggle between other powers. Certain it is that with or without legislation the Executive is charged with great responsibility. Nevertheless, that responsibility can only be discharged wisely and in such a way as to avert danger—if it is operated in a field sufficiently broad to give scope for suppleness. It cannot be operated with the full measure of success if the Executive is bound by hard and fast limitations or even if it is under the appearance of being so bound. Wisdom on the part of the Executive, then, is the second of the means that will keep this country at peace; but I repeat that even the greatest wisdom can be really effective only if sufficient scope is given for its exercise.

This Nation is so mighty both industrially and in manpower that any attitude it adopts is of paramount and probably decisive moment to the rest of the world. We may think that a purely passive attitude on our part will leave the rest of the world to work out its problems unaffected. Such is not the case. Even a passive or disinterested attitude on our part would have the most immediate effects upon other nations of the world. We cannot escape the conviction that whatever we decide is profoundly important to others as well as to ourselves. Such being the case we have to make our studies and reach our conclusions with the realization that in so doing we are influencing world events as well as determining our own.

Let me summarize in concluding. There is no guaranteed panacea that will keep this Nation at peace. By legislation we can only cut the risk through restricting certain activities of our citizens and our vessels to provide that thoughtless acts or an uncontrolled desire for profit on the part of irresponsible individuals or limited groups will not involve the Nation in the holocaust of war. There are two factors, however, that will contribute the most to the maintenance of peace. First the exercise by the Executive of wisdom and prudence in the initial stages of a dispute, provided that sufficient scope is given so that he can operate with a degree of suppleness and be free enough to meet with ingenuity any one of the countless aspects of foreign difficulties which may arise. Let there be no fear that any Executive will treat lightly this mighty responsibility. The second factor is an enlightened and vigorous public opinon so educated and so resolute that it can exercise reason even during the passions and propaganda that a great foreign war would let loose. May God give us both at the decisive moment.

Departmental Changes

SPECIAL DIVISION ESTABLISHED

[Released to the press September 2]

The Department of State has, in view of the developing situation in Europe, set up a Special Division in the Department which is to handle the special problems growing out of the repatriation of American citizens now in Europe, the representation of the interests of other Governments which may be entrusted to us, and such other special problems which from time to time may be assigned to it. The Secretary of State has appointed Mr. Breckinridge Long, former Ambassador to Italy, who had offered his services, as the head of this unit. Mr. Hugh R. Wilson, former Ambassador to Germany, will for the present assist Mr. Long in the administration of this unit. George L. Brandt, a Foreign Service officer, has been designated as the Administrative Officer. A number of Foreign Service officers of the Department of State who have been on leave of absence in this country have been ordered to Washington and assigned to this Division.

[Released to the press September 2]

The Secretary of State, on September 1, 1939, issued the following Departmental Order:

There is hereby established in the Department of State a Special Division, the routing symbol of which will be SD, to handle special problems arising out of the disturbed conditions in Europe, such as aiding in the repatriation of American citizens, the representation of the interests of other Governments taken over by this Government, and such other related problems which may be assigned to the Division.

Mr. George L. Brandt, a Foreign Service officer, with the title of Administrative Officer, will temporarily direct the Division pending the appointment of the permanent head thereof. Mr. Brandt will sign as—Administrative Officer, Special Division.

The Welfare and Whereabouts Section presently forming part of the Division of Foreign Service Administration is hereby transferred to the Special Division with the following personnel:

Mrs. Madge M. Blessing
Miss Marguerite R. Roddy
Mrs. Viola W. Faust
Miss Marion W. Sealey

Accordingly the Special Division will handle inquiries regarding the welfare and whereabouts of American citizens abroad, the transmission to those citizens of funds received for them, and matters connected with the evacuation and repatriation of such citizens, as heretofore handled in the Whereabouts and Welfare Section.

The Division will function under the general administrative supervision of Mr. Messersmith, Assistant Secretary of State, in close cooperation with the Geographical and other Divisions concerned.

The officers of the Special Division will be located in rooms 225–229 and 291–299.

The telephone numbers of the Division will be 502–503. Telephone inquiries regarding the whereabouts and welfare of Americans abroad and requests for their assistance will be received on telephone numbers 512–513.

All incoming correspondence for the Special Division will be routed direct to the Division by the Division of Communications and Records, with such secondary routing as may be necessary.

The Director of Personnel will provide the necessary clerical assistance and equipment for the new Division within the limits of the appropriated funds.

The provisions of this Order shall be effective on September 1, 1939, and shall super-

sede the provisions of any existing Order in conflict therewith.

CORDELL HULL

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
September 1, 1939.

Foreign Service

DEATH OF JULIUS G. LAY

[Released to the press August 29]

The Department has learned with regret that Mr. Julius G. Lay, American Minister, retired, died in Massachusetts August 28. Mrs. Lay survives him.

The remains are being brought to Washington, where the funeral will be held Friday, September 1, at 10 a. m., in St. Matthew's Church, Rhode Island Avenue near Connecticut Avenue.

Mr. Lay's biography, taken from the Department of State *Register* for October 1, 1937, is as follows:

LAY, JULIUS GARECHÉ.—Born Washington, D. C., August 9, 1872; Columbia Grammar School; appointed messenger in American Consulate at Ottawa September 12, 1889; clerk at Ottawa July 1, 1892; vice and deputy consul general at Ottawa September 1, 1893; consul at Windsor, Ontario, October 26, 1896; consul general at Barcelona May 3, 1899; at Canton October 3, 1904; at Cape Town May 24, 1906; at Rio de Janeiro May 2, 1910; at Berlin June 24, 1914; consul general of class two by act approved February 5, 1915; detailed to the Department March 15, 1917; acting foreign trade adviser February 18, 1918; resigned March 1, 1920; with international banking firm 1920–24; appointed, under Executive order, consul general of class two June 5, 1924; detailed to the Department June 27, 1924; Foreign Service officer of class one July 1, 1924; assigned to Calcutta August 15, 1924; secretary in the Diplomatic Service June 8, 1927; assigned as counselor of embassy at Santiago, Chile, October 13, 1927; Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary to Honduras December 16, 1929; to Uruguay December 14, 1934; delegate, Pan American Commercial Conference, Buenos Aires, 1935; retired August 31, 1937, under the provisions of the act of February 23, 1931.

International Conferences, Commissions, etc.

FIFTH MEETING OF THE INTERNATIONAL RADIO CONSULTING COMMITTEE

[Released to the press August 31]

Meetings of the Conference Committee, under the chairmanship of Dr. J. H. Dellinger, preparing for United States participation in the fifth meeting of the International Radio Consulting Committee (C. C. I. R.), to be convened at Stockholm, Sweden, about June 25, 1940, are to be held in room 474, Department of State, on September 11 and 12, 1939.

The reports of the several subcommittees studying specified questions in which the United States is a collaborating administration, will be examined by the Conference Committee for final approval before transmission to the Bern Bureau and to foreign centralizing and collaborating administrations.

The meeting will be open to anyone interested in the deliberations.

✦ ✦ ✦

TWENTY-SEVENTH INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS OF AMERICANISTS

[Released to the press September 1]

With reference to the State Department's press release of July 31, 1939,[2] concerning the participation by this Government at the Twenty-seventh International Congress of Americanists in Mexico City and Lima, this Government has designated Dr. Samuel K. Lothrop, Peabody Museum, Harvard University, and Dr. Albert A. Giesecke, of the American Embassy staff, Lima, Peru, as additional delegates of the United States at the Lima meeting.

[2] See the *Bulletin* of August 5, 1939 (Vol. I, No. 6), p. 100.

Treaty Information

Compiled by the Treaty Division

ORGANIZATION

Protocol for the Amendment of the Preamble, of Articles 1, 4, and 5, and of the Annex to the Covenant of the League of Nations

Poland

According to a circular letter from the League of Nations dated August 19, 1939, the instrument of ratification by Poland of the Protocol for the Amendment of the Preamble, of Articles 1, 4, and 5, and of the Annex to the Covenant of the League of Nations, which was opened for signature at Geneva on September 30, 1938, was deposited with the Secretariat on August 7, 1939.

EDUCATION

Procès-Verbal Concerning the Application of Articles IV, V, VI, VII, IX, XII, and XIII of the Convention of October 11, 1933, for Facilitating the International Circulation of Films of an Educational Character

Poland

According to a circular letter from the League of Nations dated August 19, 1939, the instrument of ratification by Poland of the Procès-Verbal Concerning the Application of Articles IV, V, VI, VII, IX, XII, and XIII of the Convention of October 11, 1933, for Facilitating the International Circulation of Films of an Educational Character, which was opened for signature at Geneva on September 12, 1938, was deposited with the Secretariat on August 7, 1939. The signature of the Procès-Verbal by Poland, which had been given subject to ratification, should be considered as definitive as from August 7, 1939.

EXTRADITION

Extradition Treaty With Liberia

On August 30, 1939, the President ratified the Extradition Treaty between the United States and Liberia, signed on November 1, 1937.

Extradition Treaty With Monaco

On August 30, 1939, the President ratified the Extradition Treaty between the United States and Monaco, signed on February 15, 1939.

HEALTH

Convention Modifying the International Sanitary Convention of June 21, 1926

The American Ambassador to France transmitted with a despatch dated August 9, 1939, a procès-verbal dated July 24, 1939, received from the French Government, recording the adherence of Belgium to the convention signed at Paris on October 31, 1938, modifying the International Sanitary Convention of June 21, 1926, and the deposit of the instruments of ratification of the convention of 1938 of Egypt, France, Great Britain, and Italy. A second procès-verbal, also dated July 24, 1939, was received from the French Government in fulfillment of the formalities required of that Government by article 5 of the convention with respect to the deposit of the instrument of ratification by Egypt of the convention of October 31, 1938.

The two procès-verbaux each contained the following statement, which was inserted therein at the request of the Egyptian representative:

[Translation]

"The Egyptian Government wishes to point out that, both because of the nature thereof and because of the absence in their text of a provision relative to their ratification, neither the Final Act nor the Declaration attached thereto should be ratified and that, accordingly, the ratification of the Egyptian Government applies only to the Convention itself."

By virtue of the provisions of article 6 therof, the convention of October 31, 1938, entered into force as of July 24, 1939, when the requisite number of four instruments of ratification had been deposited.

NATIONALITY

Convention With Finland Regulating Military Obligations in Certain Cases of Double Nationality

On August 14, 1939, the President ratified the Convention Regulating Military Obligations in Certain Cases of Double Nationality between the United States and Finland, signed on January 27, 1939.

COMMERCE

Treaty of Commerce and Navigation With Iraq

On August 30, 1939, the President ratified the Treaty of Commerce and Navigation between the United States and Iraq, signed on December 3, 1938.

Treaty of Friendship, Commerce, and Navigation With Liberia

On August 30, 1939, the President ratified the Treaty of Friendship, Commerce, and Navigation between the United States and Liberia, signed on August 8, 1938.

LABOR

Conventions of the International Labor Conference

Union of South Africa

According to a circular letter from the League of Nations dated August 19, 1939, the instrument of ratification by the Government of the Union of South Africa of the Convention Concerning Statistics of Wages and Hours of Work in the Principal Mining and Manufacturing Industries Including Building and Construction and in Agriculture, adopted by the International Labor Conference at its twenty-fourth session (Geneva, June 2–22, 1938), was registered with the Secretariat on August 8, 1939. The said ratification excludes parts II and IV of the convention in accordance with the first paragraph of its article 2. According to the information of the Department the following countries have ratified the convention: Denmark, Sweden, and the Union of South Africa.

NAVIGATION

International Load Line Convention (Treaty Series No. 858)

Indochina

The British Ambassador at Washington informed the Secretary of State by a note dated August 16, 1939, that the date of the effect of the application to French Indochina of the International Load Line Convention, signed at London on July 5, 1930, was January 15, 1939, and not November 15, 1938, as previously stated in the Ambassador's note of April 27, 1939.

The countries which have ratified or adhered to the convention are as follows: United States of America, Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Canada, Chile,

China, Cuba, Danzig, Denmark, Egypt, Estonia, Finland, France, French Indochina, Germany, Great Britain, Greece, Hong Kong, Hungary, Iceland, India, Ireland (Eire), Italy, Japan, Japan for Chosen, Taiwan, and Leased Territory of Kwantung, Latvia, Mexico, Netherlands, Netherlands East Indies and Curaçao, Newfoundland, New Zealand (including Western Samoa), Norway, Panama, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Rumania, Spain, Straits Settlements, Sweden, Thailand, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Uruguay, and Yugoslavia.

Agreement Concerning Manned Lightships Not on Their Stations

Burma

According to a circular letter from the League of Nations dated August 19, 1939, a notification was received by the Secretariat on August 9, 1939, from the British Government stating that it desires that the Agreement Concerning Manned Lightships Not on Their Stations, signed at Lisbon on October 23, 1930, in which Burma formerly participated as part of India, should be regarded, by virtue of paragraph 2 of article 8 of the agreement, as applying to Burma as a British overseas territory, with effect as from April 1, 1937, the date on which Burma was separated from India and acquired its new status.

According to the information of the Department the countries in respect of which the agreement is now in force as a result of definitive signature, ratification, or adherence are: Belgium, Brazil, Burma, China, Danzig, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France (including French West Africa, French Equatorial Africa, Togoland, Cameroun, Madagascar, French Settlements in India, Indochina, Reunion, French Coast of Somaliland, New Caledonia, Oceania, Martinique, Guadeloupe, Guiana, and St. Pierre and Miquelon), Great Britain, Greece, India, Iraq, Latvia, Monaco, Morocco, the Netherlands (including the Netherlands Indies), Poland, Portugal, Rumania, Spain, Sweden, Tunis, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Turkey, and Yugoslavia.

The agreement entered into force on January 21, 1931.

PUBLICATIONS

Convention on Interchange of Publications

On August 14, 1939, the President ratified, subject to the understanding contained in the Senate resolution of August 1, 1939, giving its advice and consent to ratification,[3] the Convention on Interchange of Publications, signed at the Inter-American Conference for the Maintenance of Peace at Buenos Aires on December 23, 1936.

CONSULAR

Consular Convention With Liberia

On August 14, 1939, the President ratified the Consular Convention between the United States and Liberia, signed on October 7, 1938.

[3] See the *Bulletin* for August 5, 1939 (Vol. I, No. 6), pp. 103–104.

U. S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE: 1939

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, Washington, D. C.—Price 10 cents - - - - - Subscription price, $2.75 a year

PUBLISHED WITH THE APPROVAL OF THE DIRECTOR OF THE BUREAU OF THE BUDGET